

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VIII

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 6, 1915

No. 15

IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.56 attention was called to a pamphlet entitled Latin and Greek in Education, consisting of articles by members of the faculty of the University of Colorado, published as University of Colorado Bulletin, Vol. XIV, No. 9. Since, in spite of the generous offer of the University to supply copies, without charge, to all who are interested, so long as the edition lasts, it may well be that not all of our readers have seen the pamphlet, an indication of part at least of its contents may be of interest and value. It may be noted here, that in spite of all that has been printed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY concerning the value of the Classics, its readers, in letters to the editor, are often asking for fresh material on this topic. Twice lately I have been asked to supply matter of this sort to be used in a very definite effort which an individual is making in a very definite sphere in support of the Classics.

Professor Lawrence W. Cole, of the Department of Psychology, discusses, in a very interesting way, the claims made that Latin and Greek are excellent disciplines of a liberal education and a splendid preparation for professional and technical training. In support of these claims he finds a host of witnesses of whose credibility there can be no question—Lord Kelvin, Karl Pearson, Matthew Arnold, Bryce, Lowell, Barrett Wendell, Professor Grandgent, Brunetière, and Anatole France. Not a single one of these men has had professional interest in the Classics. Their testimony, Professor Cole continues, has been confirmed by the results of wholesale experiments, both here and abroad, to educate the young without the aid of the Classics. These experiments have all been failures. Many professors of the sciences prefer as students those who have had training in Latin and Greek. In the field of psychology Professor Cole himself finds that the sophomores whom he tries to induct, in large numbers, into the secrets of psychology do better work if they have had training in the Classics.

The difficulty, so far as I can define it, lies in this. Besides learning to see objects, the student must learn to make nice but definite discriminations, must form certain general notions, and must, above all things, learn to detect relations. Now analysis, generalization, and relational thinking are developed and trained above all things else by the study of Latin and Greek. For this reason, your classicist is always an educated man. He finds in psychology a subject both of training and information, and he promptly goes to the deeper levels of that information. Others

obtain as much information from the subject as their previous training and their industry permit. (See page 13).

On the question of formal discipline Professor Cole, a psychologist, be it repeated, takes a very vigorous position, affirmatively, far more vigorous than that adopted by Mr. Jenner in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.26-29. Since, he says (14), the first group-experiments designed to measure the effect of discipline and the amount of its transfer failed to find transfer, transfer was denied and the existence of such a thing as discipline was gravely suspected.

Now we know that the wrong conclusion was drawn from the experiments. The conclusion should have been not that transfer does not occur, but that *the method used was too crude to detect it* (the italics are Professor Cole's; so are the footnotes). Careful individual experiments have recently been made and Ebert and Meumann¹, Coover and Angell², Winch³, Bennett⁴, Fracker⁵ and others have found transfer of discipline in marked degree. The doctrine of "no-transfer" is exploded⁶ and if its former advocates do not admit the explosion openly they do so tacitly in their recent writings.

There is positive transfer, *i.e.*, increase of one mental ability by training another, and in some cases, negative transfer, or decrease in some ability due to long exercise of others, and this, I believe, was exactly the opinion held by sensible men before the cry of "no-transfer" was raised. Once it was raised it was used to bolster up the most extravagant claims of all sorts of educators. One teacher of education denied even the fact of training of special mental powers by their own exercise. It was all a beautiful example of loading the negative results of hasty group-experiments with positive conclusions, for which "scientific accuracy" was claimed.

¹Archiv f.d. gesamte Psychologie. IV, 1904.

²Amer. J. of Psych. XVIII, 1907.

³Winch, W. H. Brit. J. of Psych. II, 1908.

⁴Bennett, C. J. Formal Discipline, N. Y. 1907.

⁵Fracker, G. C. Psych. Rev. Monog. Supp. IX, 1907.

⁶Recently British psychologists have renewed the attack on the problem and with refined mathematical methods. All but one of the investigators find a greater per cent of correlation than can be ascribed to chance or error. Moreover, the correlations arrange themselves in a hierarchy, thus giving evidence, the authors say, of a "common fund of energy" or general intelligence which may be exercised in a variety of types of mental work. This is a startling return to an old belief. Yet it must still be emphasized that neither the experimental method used in testing for correlation nor the mathematical treatment of the results is well enough established to justify its use as a foundation for educational dogma. To this opinion the British investigators subscribe. But if the method is still not adequately verified, what shall we say of the crude experiments of fifteen years ago? Their use suggests vividly the remark of Hodgson: "Whatever you are totally ignorant of assert to be the explanation of everything else". This is, of course, quackery in education, as it was in philosophy, but the quackery has worked too well. We surely need to discriminate between the educational mountebank and the expert in education. In the present state of our knowledge the latter is characterized by the fact that he, first of all, avoids doing great harm.

The claims of Latin and Greek rest so much on a belief in their disciplinary value that the "no-transfer" propaganda was almost the last nail in the coffin of the classics. The worst effect is that discipline has no longer been aimed at in high schools, by either teachers or pupils. The course of study has as often been a *mélange* of novelties as a group of subjects whose mastery required industry. Little wonder that Professor Grandgent calls our educational present "The Dark Ages".

Professor John B. Ekeley, Professor of Chemistry, discussing the Classics as a Training for the Scientist (16-19), begins by declaring that, in his experience, the assumption that the scientific world regards classical studies as of slight value is unfounded. He knows many scientists and engineers who value the study of the Classics not only for the pleasure they derived from them, but also for the intellectual power they gained from them. One very prominent mining engineer has told him that the Classics taught him "how to use the tools of his profession". He himself believes in the study of the Classics and its continuance in the University for those who contemplate a scientific or technical career, partly because such study alone leads to the broadest conception of life, partly because such study is a simple means, most easily carried out, of acquiring that precision of thought and exactness of expression which is so necessary for the future scientist or engineer. Both of these goals are the aim of any well-balanced education. True enjoyment of life is possible only through a knowledge and understanding of those subtleties of life, those intangible pleasures which come from literature, art, music, philosophy, none of which can be truly appreciated without a broad training in the Classics. The scientist especially needs these things, particularly as a balance for preserving his mental equilibrium. "The intellectual arrogance of the humanist is only exceeded by that of the scientist". How does the study of the Classics make a man a better engineer? It is very clear, says Professor Ekeley (17-19):

Our methods of secondary education have recently suffered rather severe and just criticism from those who have observed their shortcomings. Continued additions to the curriculum of the high school, usually made by the courses which give a smattering of half a dozen sciences, have wasted the time of the students at a period when they should have been acquiring habits of study and not have been confused by being introduced to too many new conceptions. Their time has been largely wasted in acquiring hazy ideas of a few elementary principles of chemistry, a subject for which, by reason of their youth, they are hardly prepared. How much better it would be for them to exercise their minds upon some task adapted to their state of mental development. Here are two languages—Greek and Latin, difficult to master, but holding out to them difficulties with which their minds are prepared to grapple. The training offered is such that it develops in them a sense of intellectual power, a sense which certainly is diminished when they fail to appreciate the true significance, let us say, of atomic weights, no matter how well they are taught. Habits of clear thinking and exact expression develop in them, these being the logical result of the mastery of the intricacies of the grammar and of the putting of the thought of

the ancient writer in the words of their mother tongue. Does an attempt to express a necessarily vague idea of a modern theory of solutions, for instance, make for habits of clear thinking and precise expression in the mind of a youth in his early teens? I feel sure that every teacher who has listened to the lame and immature attempts of an average high-school student to give a statement of some fairly simple scientific theory would much prefer to listen to his conjugation of a Greek verb.

May I repeat—a student, properly trained in the Greek and Latin languages and in mathematics, at a period when these studies by their very nature have drilled him in habits of industry, clearness of thought, have given him a feeling of mental power, and have furnished him with an invaluable foundation for a knowledge of his own language; such a student, I say, comes to the university equipped to attack successfully whatever is offered him. On the other hand, the product of some of our modern high-school methods, trained by means of a mixture of half a dozen half-baked courses in science, together with a little of this and that, feels himself overwhelmed the first month, and unless he is an unusual person, gives up in despair.

It therefore seems to me very clear that the supporters of the claims of the classics in the high school and the university have by far the better of the argument.

The paper by Professor J. Raymond Brackett, Dean of the Graduate School, and Professor of English and Comparative Literature, bears the title *The Open Door* (20-23). He holds that Greek should be taught in the Public Schools of Colorado because it is one of the most beautiful languages in existence, and because it has the richest content. In art and literature the Greeks reached higher levels than other nations, and reached them with smaller populations and in less time. He then discusses the "common delusion . . . in respect to translations", the idea that one can get Greek through translations (20).

In the summer of 1912 I spent a hot day trying to learn Thermopylae. Baedeker indicates some ruined Turkish barracks as the place where Leonidas fell. Our leader, a noted archaeologist, gave the details of the advance and retreat to this spot. I looked at the knoll with incredulity; Roosevelt's rough riders could rush the point hundreds abreast. Putting Baedeker in my pocket, I detached myself from the party, and, camera in hand, began to search for a pass between the mountain and the sea. Having found a place that seemed right, I made my pictures and waited months for confirmation. I found a translation of the account of the battle by Herodotus; there were several important places in the narrative where I felt that I must have the original words—the Greek. Three or four Greek words here and there at crucial points gave me my Thermopylae—a Thermopylae that Baedeker or archaeologist could not give or take away. Every word of Herodotus is an open door, opened to show you the battlefield by one who had seen it. Every word of the translation closes an open door and puts a strange word in its place; and this strange word is sometimes not a door at all but an obstruction. The translator had never been at Thermopylae; he could not see through the open doors of Herodotus. We sometimes imagine that a translator, if of equal ability with the original writer, can give us a translation equal to the original; but even such an uncommon translator might fail in fidelity because he does not have the experience of the original writer, and, therefore, cannot see through his open doors. What I have said of Thermopylae is likely to be true of any investigation

about which a man is deeply in earnest. I was pleased to learn that the only scientific surveyors of Thermopylae, Leake, and Grundy, went through much the same process and arrived at the same result.

If there is a chance for misapprehension in such tangible things as rocks and cliffs, plains and sea, how much greater chance for error in treatment of the invisible things, seen only by the mind's eye? Longinus on the sublime, Aristotle on art and poetry—such great works are places in which to grow, to look long at the open doors, glimpsing great thoughts that may be obscured or eclipsed by the best translator.

C. K.

(To be Continued)

GREEK POETRY IN ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS:

In an article entitled *The Business of a College Greek Department*, in *The Classical Journal*, 9. 111-121, Professor Clarence P. Bill raises a question which deserves careful consideration by Greek teachers—the advisability of teaching Greek literature through translations, in courses where knowledge of the original is not required.

About five years ago I sent a questionnaire to one hundred classical scholars and teachers in Universities, Colleges and Preparatory Schools, to which there were thirty-nine actual answers from thirty-seven different institutions. The eighth question was: Do you believe that the Classics are helped in actual value to education or in maintaining their standing in education by the giving of courses in art, literature, etc., where no knowledge of the original is required? Those voting yes outright were 11 in number; 8 thought them helpful to a limited extent. Three regarded such courses doubtfully as of value for literature. One believed in them, but not as a help to the Classics. This gives a total of 23. Over against these were 9 nays, 1 no for literature, who thinks this fad overdone, 1 who favored such a course in archaeology, 4 who favored it for art—16 in all. Those decidedly voting yes or no are about 11 to 9; the others are practically undecided.

One of the ripest scholars of the Middle West writes:

Yes. This is better than leaving so many young people entirely ignorant of things classical, i.e. of the benefactions made to the modern world by the Greeks and the Romans.

I give here the major part of the letter which Professor Penick sent with his paper. It supplements in important particulars the paper itself.

C. K.

"As you will see from a casual reading of the enclosed article on Greek translation courses, I have made no effort to argue the question, but have given instead what some of my students have said. These statements were made after the completion of the course and no one was called upon to say anything except what he actually felt. I think the views are all genuine.

I would much rather teach the original and do teach both Greek and Latin, but am willing to sacrifice myself to the extent of one course for what I believe to be the good of the cause. We make every effort to avoid having this course interfere with the regular Greek courses and I think we succeed. It is not allowed until the Junior year, a time when no student is likely to begin a language. We cannot hope to enroll in classical study any who take this course, but we can enlist their interest and co-operation in promoting the Classics among younger students whom they may know and teach later. Even if we do not get students into our classical courses as a result of this course, we do not keep any out, and we do give many a taste of those good things that would otherwise be denied them *in toto*."

Another writes:

They are, indirectly. No general course such as here contemplated can replace first-hand knowledge. But we can reach adults by these means, and engender in them respect for the knowledge of the Classics, and thereby create the demand that these things be taught to their children.

Here is another answer:

Yes, I believe with all my heart in courses in Greek literature in translation. I have had an extended experience of seven years with such courses and am thoroughly pleased. One objection made to such courses is that the student is not getting the masterpieces in the original. But I would contend that, even when he gets his Pindar at 60 lines a day, he is not getting it in the original in most cases. He is after all only getting a translation, to be sure his own translation, but a translation for all that. The original can only be got by feeling the Greek in Greek.

From the far West comes this reply:

I believe in such courses, but I do not think they help the Classics. Without them, however, large numbers of present-day students would get no insight into the character of ancient civilization.

We read from the far East:

Yes. Such a course is given in . . . University this year, and is very successful.

For several years a course entitled *Greek Poetry in English Translation* has been given here. At first the course was given experimentally two hours a week, but was soon allowed to become a full course of three hours a week. Last year it was made an advanced course, which means that a prerequisite of two English courses is required, amounting in practically every case to a restriction to Juniors and Seniors. The number in the class has varied from 15 to 25, and that without any canvassing for numbers and without any advertisement outside of the Greek school announcements, where non-Greek students rarely ever look. The class has grown through the loyalty of those who have taken the course. No knowledge of Greek is required, but some who have had Greek take the course and express high appreciation of the pleasure and the profit received. The fall term is devoted to epic poetry, the winter term to lyric, the spring term to dramatic poetry. Practically all of the Greek poetry known to us is read and studied as literature. From this literature the Greeks are studied in every relation of life—domestic, social, business, legal, artistic, religious. Effort is made to show something of what is lost in translation. The stress, of course, must be placed on the content rather than on the form, but the students must learn that the greatness of the Greeks was in form, both in art and in language, as well as in content, and thereby, in some small measure, come to appreciate the beauty of that which they miss.

My only argument will be quotations from letters written by those who have completed the course, in response to my request for a statement as to whether they thought such a course was worth while and as to what specific value they received from the course.

Before I give the quotations, a few statements will not be amiss.

(1) The whole educational trend to-day is along the lines of least resistance, a striving after the so-called practical subjects (which are no longer the sciences), the vocational subjects, etc., and away from those things which require mental labor, the things that have cultural value, the humanistic topics.

(2) Even the few people who have cultural instincts and tendencies are so much influenced by their associations that they desire to get what culture they can with the smallest possible amount of effort.

(3) For these reasons we should use our utmost endeavor to keep as many as possible in the straight and narrow path of classical rectitude, the study of Greek and Latin originals.

(4) We must also face the fact that, if the tide that has set in against us is ever stemmed, it will be only after a long and a hard fight, and, further, that we must be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves.

(5) Our harmlessness must take the form of not aggravating the opposition, and our wisdom may be in keeping the Classics before the public eye in every legitimate way. What way can be more legitimate, next to the study of the people and of the language first-hand, than an intensive study, not a mere reading, of their poetic masterpieces, which have been the inspiration of all subsequent literatures, which give us an insight into every phase of the people's life, and so help us to appreciate in some measure, at least, the greatness of the people who have been the admiration of the centuries?

(6) Because we cannot persuade the educational masses that they are wrong in neglecting what we regard as the summum bonum, we should not grow petulant and refuse to let some crumbs fall from our bountiful classical table. If the many will not take the cream, why deny them the skim milk? If they will not take the best, let us give them the best they will take.

Quotations on the importance of such a course as has been outlined above follow²:

The course made me wish that I had studied Greek enough to read the originals.—The study of Homer is to serve as a standard for all my literary criticism.—Still more valuable and interesting to me was the study of the spirit and technique of the Greek drama.—Another value of such a course is the training it gives in English. I know, too, that my reading of other great pieces of literature will no longer be handicapped by an obscure notion of the mythological allusions, and for this fact alone I am extremely glad that the study of Homer's masterpieces has fallen to my lot.—It is a stimulation to the imagination and thus has a broadening effect.—For the student who has been so unfortunate as to omit Greek and Latin from his course of study, such a translation course fills a real need.

I give next quotations on the topic of the help that comes in the appreciation of one's own literature:

I have found this course of great help to me in my other work, especially in advanced literature.—In my study of Shakesperian and modern drama, my course in Greek drama gave me a valuable foundation.—How interesting it was to discover how far the Greeks had developed lyric poetry and how much we owe them!—It made me realize just how wonderful a literature the ancients had and its tremendous influence on all later literature.—My love and appreciation of all good literature has been increased.—It stimulated my interest in the life and works of a remarkable people, and it gave me a keener appreciation for all literary work.

The value of a knowledge of the Greeks and their history is stressed in the following quotations:

Before my study in this course, Homer and his works were mere names to me; now they are among my most interesting acquaintances. I understand the Homeric simile, the Homeric style, and have learned to consider Homer a standard on which to base my judgment of literature. A knowledge of his works fills the mind with pure and wholesome thoughts which make life more worth while. It gives a broader scope to the imagination and widens the sympathies.—We are enabled to study the crude manners and quaint beliefs of the people, to see them in their homes, in the markets, at their sports. From the standpoint, then, of the study of human nature and civilization, we profit by the Greek translation course. We can likewise profit from the standpoint of the study of literature per se. The graphicness, the sublimity, the beauty, and, above all, the dignity of the language are qualities that appeal to those who strive to cultivate a good literary style. I not only enjoyed this course very much, but I gained much information regarding the Greek theater, the authors, the character of the plays, and the demands of the times in which they were written.—But the course was of most value to me in that it changed my opinion of everything Grecian. It gave me a glimpse of the very interesting and very alive daily life of the Greeks, the simplicity and attractiveness of it. It gave me an idea of the roundness and fullness of Greek drama. It made me realize the beauty of Greek poetry, poetry still beautiful after having been translated. The most it meant was not to have finished a College course in complete ignorance of the entire Greek world.—For one who has not had a sufficient knowledge of Greek to read in the vernacular the great Classics, there is nothing that will acquaint him more thoroughly with the life, manners and thought of the Greeks than a translation course. Great Hellas becomes a very part of one's self through the fascinating histories of the great poets and heroes who have immortalized the lives of their people, whose human nature is the same as that the world over. One gains a conception of the enduring Greek principles of right and wrong. Right is exalted and rewarded, and evil punished.—A very personal interest in the old heroes of the Iliad and the Odyssey, knowledge of Greek life, customs and ideals, the mental attitude of the Greeks as to beauty and physical development are among the interesting features of the course.—Must those of us who are ignorant of the ancient tongue and who do not find the original within our reach go without even knowing the greatest poets of antiquity, and the noblest poems of those times?

A paragraph of quotations on the enjoyment derived from the course is given to show that there is a demand for something of the kind:

²Here and below the utterances of different students are parted by dashes.

I consider it one of the most enjoyable courses I have had in the University.—The study of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* has given me real, unbroken pleasure: there has not been a day when I have not looked forward eagerly to the lesson. As well as I like my English and my history, I cannot say the same for them. Both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have been rather hard for me, because I was unfamiliar with the geography, the supposed history, the theology connected with the stories, and almost every day I needed to consult maps and books of reference and to reread much of the story. . . It took me much time to get the proper viewpoint, but still the work was always enjoyable to me.—I enjoyed the course on account of (1) the help that I have received from the books as pieces of literature; (2) the companionship in thought that I have gotten from the books; (3) the spiritual good that they have given me. As works of literature, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have taught me how to judge literature. I use them as models as to content, as to construction and as to style. Under the head of style especially could I learn many things, among which would be the value of concrete embodiment, of clear, simple language, of rapidity, of gentle, easy movement, of irrelevant detail, of condensation in times of action, of similes and epithets. I have a fresh fund of things to think about; I have plenty of fresh scenes to conjure up as I churn and sweep and feed the chickens and sit on the big wide gallery in the evenings, with no one but an old negro woman to keep me real company; I shall not be lonely; these books will bring me guests galore. And there are many spiritual lessons that we could learn of them, lessons of prayer, obedience, sacrifice, absolute trust.—Of all my five years' work in the University, it is one of the two courses that I remember with most profit and pleasure. It is one of the few courses whose text-books I have kept and care to reread. I always get enthusiastic when I talk about that course. The course has meant to me a study as interesting, absorbing and consequently lacking in irksomeness as any I had while in the University.—I remember no course during my five years in the University that gave me keener pleasure than our Greek Translation Course.—The course, when I took it, was truly a delight to me and has been of lasting pleasure and benefit. It has stayed with me as few of my other University courses have.—I specialized more in economics and government and allied subjects than in literature while I was in the University. However, I never had a course that I enjoyed more than the Greek Translation Course. I have found the knowledge of Greek literature I obtained then very helpful to me in all of my subsequent readings and even in more practical things.

Many more similar statements could be given.

In a closing paragraph I give most of two shorter letters and several selected parts from a third, because they seem to have considerable merit and are written in a better style than some of the others. All three writers have studied more or less in the original.

To those of us who have been fortunate enough to study them in the original, the beauty, the grace, the exquisite charm of the Greek writers have meant a great deal, but to those who are not familiar with the Greek tongue much that is best, if in fact not all, of ancient classical literature is inaccessible except through English translations. Granting that much of the charm, the grace and beauty of the original is lost when translated, still, the subject-matter which, after all, is what has assured Homer, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles and many more of those writers of ancient

Greece an abiding place in the hearts of all posterity, remains to enlighten and entertain us. Therefore I most earnestly hope that you will continue your plan of giving courses in translation from the Greek masterpieces.—I never caught the Greek spirit, was never transplanted into the midst of their life, and never grasped their viewpoint, never felt the genius of their thought, or experienced with them their emotions, in fact, I never knew them at all, until I read their literature all through from Homer to Aristophanes; until I read rapidly, as a continuous whole, this large body of literature (you made us read a plenty). Since we read rapidly and fluently in English, the attention undiverted by the constant agony of translation, it was truly the discovery of a 'new world' to me—a new world that burst suddenly in all of its splendor upon my sight. Otherwise Greek literature would have remained a sealed book, the glorious land of the Greeks an undiscovered country; for without the translation course I could never have gained a 'peak in Darien', never have caught even a distant glimpse of those classic shores. The knowledge I have gained from studying Greek literature has shed a great deal of light upon the subsequent history and development of various forms of literature, epic, lyric and dramatic, especially the development of the drama from the worship of Dionysus, and its growth through Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and the rise of comedy in Aristophanes.—Acquaintanceship with Greek literature not only greatly enhances and enriches our appreciation of English literature, but also opens up to the mind new realms of gold. The average person can attain this wealth most readily through translations. A study of Greek literature by translations is of vital value both to the Barbarian and to the Greek. For the former it is the only key that unlocks this treasure-house of wealth untold. For the Greek it is the best way for the extensive study of the literature as an aid to an intensive study of the language. It is this latter, the studying of the language, that consumes the most of our time and energy during the College course; and we are so engaged in acquiring facility in translation that we fail to grasp as literature the significance of what we read. Vocabulary, forms, sentence-order, meter, and the like are what engage the attention of the amateur, and constitute the beam that mars his vision of the literature, of the *Iliad* as an epic, of Agamemnon as a drama, of Homer's power of narrative in its sheer beauty, of Aeschylus's Titan-like chisel. Now a course in translations remedies such defects, as an ally, not as an opponent. I contend that in studying the original it is the language that the student keeps in mind. I contend for the study of the language, and I deprecate the indifference toward the Greek language manifested in these latter days by the majority of College students. But I contend that there is a vital need in the curriculum for a course of Greek literature in translation. Such a course in my College was one of rare charm for me. I know something of what Keats meant in the latter part of his sonnet, On first looking into Chapman's Homer.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

DANIEL A. PENICK.

REVIEWS

A Theory of Civilization. By Sholto O. G. Douglas.
New York: The Macmillan Company (1914).
246 pp. \$1.50.

Mr. Douglas seems to be delightfully in earnest about this theory of civilization. He does not waste any time or space in telling who he is, or in dedicating

his book to anyone, or in saying whether or not he has any obligations to acknowledge. But these omissions must be from innate modesty, a characteristic of the author which one must deduce from pages 237 and 241, where he says, "According to the theory so feebly adumbrated in the preceding pages", and, "But even the paltry thoughts of a poor thinker", etc. Such frank statements ought to disarm even a critic who had theories of his own about civilization.

The keynote of our author's philosophical adumbration is "Psychic Illusion". After reading about the psychic illusion of the "Olympian", and the psychic illusion of the "Christian civilization", and then seeing these words, "To what height man ultimately may climb, in the illimitable vistas of endless civilizations following endless and ever higher psychic illusions, we cannot even faintly imagine in our wildest dreams", the reviewer must own to a thrill of expectant exaltation which he found later he was not justified in feeling.

The author has evidently read, in a casual way, rather widely in history and religion, but he might better, perhaps, have given no references at all, for, in the few places where he does cite references, he could have given others which have greater authority. His chapter on Ancient Greece would have been enhanced in value if he had known anything about Cretan civilization. Indeed, in the fall of that power he might even have found the failure of another psychic illusion.

It will be very humiliating for those historians who have committed themselves to a belief in the Horatian *saeva paupertas et avitus fundus* and *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*, to find, when they reach the chapter on Early Roman Civilization, that the heroic self-sacrifice of the Decii is all due to psychic illusion and to "the action and reaction of irrational motives on Roman conduct".

A reader will follow the author along through the vicissitudes of the heterodoxies of the dark ages into the light of the Catholic and Protestant Christian civilizations. From that vantage point he may then see (in Part II) a sort of kaleidoscopic panorama of Egypt, Buddhism, Islam, Confucianism, and of Ancient Mexico and Peru, and realize how their psychic illusions fell short of producing real civilization. It is especially interesting, however, to find that Mexico, with Quetzalcoatl *et al.*, would probably have developed culture and a high intelligence "if Columbus had not discovered America".

The book leads up to two conclusions, one of which is delightfully English. After saying that Hellenic culture was the outcome of faith in the religion of Hellas, and explaining the religious origin of Roman culture, and of the Catholic culture of the Renaissance, the author says, "Similarly our modern civilization in England <the italics are mine> is the outcome of faith in the Protestant form of Christianity. What, then, is to be the outcome of the future?", thus dis-

closing at the same time the beam in his own eye and the twinkle in that of the rest of the world. The real conclusion of the book, however, is that the psychic illusion of Christianity is sometime to become a disillusion, and that decadence will follow, but that a new illusion will come which cannot be conceived as a new version of the Christian faith, but which must be founded on a new religion of irrationality, "so that rational self seeking motives may have the least possible influence upon conduct".

Mr. Douglas's book may safely be commended to mature readers. It is written in a charming and easy style, it will conduce here and there to armchair thought, and it cannot possibly hurt anyone.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. RALPH V. D. MAGOFFIN.

Recent Developments in Textual Criticism. By Albert C. Clark. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1914). Pp. 28. 1 shilling, net.

Professor Clark, the well-known Ciceronian scholar recently appointed Corpus Professor at Oxford, here publishes his inaugural lecture. As is proper, he gives first a pleasing picture of the personal side of his great predecessor, Robinson Ellis; one story he tells must be quoted. "To him a scholiast was almost sacred. . . Once, when the statement of a scholiast was impugned, he said with some emotion, 'Do I understand that Mr. X wishes to vilipend the scholiast?'" But Ellis's methods of text-criticism, brilliant as were the results, differ widely from his successor's; and this little pamphlet is an interesting summary of the principles applied by text-critics nowadays. In contrast to Bentley, who "treated his manuscripts in a masterful way much 'as if they had been Fellows of Trinity', the methods of modern criticism are more humble and in a way more mechanical". Professor Clark instances the great progress in palaeography due to the liberality of libraries and the introduction of photography, and the revolution in its methods made by Traube, Lindsay, Loew, and others. Another aid to critics is the development of historical research; the study of mediaeval catalogues often enables us to trace manuscripts or their later descendants. Professor Clark gives several interesting examples of this. He then cites Professor Shipley's study of a Caroline manuscript copied from the Fifth Century Puteaneus of Livy, which proves that the changes are mainly mechanical. Even the ancient papyri in general confirm tradition, and indicate that the chief corruptions in Greek manuscripts arose before the days of Alexandrian criticism. A recently discovered papyrus of Cicero's *Pro Caelio* contains a number of passages omitted in the best manuscript, and interpolated (as had been thought by such keen critics as Madvig) in inferior ones. Professor Clark is at his best in the subject of prose-rhythm, a science in which he excels. The ancients were fond of using certain cadences at the end of sentence divisions; as he says, "This system

can be illustrated from English, which, when it took over a number of Latin words, also inherited the Latin rhythms. The typical examples are *servants departed, perfect felicity, glorious undertaking*. Cicero had his favorite *clausulae*; and the application of this test shows that the speeches *Post Reditum* and the later *Catilinarian* orations are genuine, but that the invective against Sallust and the *Consolatio* are spurious. Madvig's *potuerint* for the manuscript *potuerunt* in Cat. 3.22 would give a *clausula* unique in 17902; therefore the chances are 18000 to one against it. But the rhythm permeates the whole sentence in Cicero; he avoids a dactylic cadence everywhere. "Cicero does not say *mūltā mīnārī* or *mūltūm mīnītārī*. The regular use is *mūltūm mīnārī*, but *mūltā mīnītārī*". The last third of the lecture is devoted to the question of omissions in manuscripts. These are apt to be single lines in the original, overlooked by the copyist; or they may be single columns or pages. In considering the Gospel passages contained in the longest of our three texts (the so-called Western text), but omitted by the Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Sinaiticus, our oldest manuscripts, Professor Clark discovered that the doubtful passages have the following number of letters: Luke 5.14, 166 letters; John 5.4, 167; Matt. 20.28, 320; John 7.53-8. 11, 829; Mk. 16.9-20, 964. "I look", he says, "upon the numbers 160-167 as representing a page or column in an archetype, which appears to have contained 16 lines with an average of 11 letters to the line". The omission of these passages, then, would be due to the overlooking of one or more columns—a conclusion strengthened by the presence of these passages in the oldest versions (dating from the second century) and by the citations of early Fathers. This is a very interesting discovery; but so many different elements affect the forming of any conclusion that one must call Professor Clark's discussion of these New Testament problems stimulating rather than final.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

C. U. CLARK.

Greek Sculpture and Modern Art. By Charles Waldstein. Cambridge: at the University Press (1914). Pp. xii + 70, lxxviii plates. \$2.00.

In order to criticize fairly the two lectures which make up the contents of this book it must be borne in mind that Dr. Waldstein is addressing young students of art. In his Preface, however, he states that it had been suggested to him to publish these lectures in a more permanent form, because they might prove useful, not only to students of art, but also to the general public, "as an introduction into the study of sculpture". That the lectures will be of interest to students of art and to the general public I am willing to grant, but I have grave doubts how far they may prove useful as an introduction to the study of sculpture.

The chief aim of the author is to show that the study of Greek sculpture, so far as its fundamental principles and its main achievements are concerned, is not only profitable but also essential to the student of art. In this I heartily agree with him. The first lecture deals with the technique, the second with the subject-matter of art.

Dr. Waldstein begins with the thesis that the ancient Greeks introduced innovations in technique corresponding to the nature of the materials at their disposal. With certain modifications this is true, but when our lecturer illustrates his point he advances untenable theories. So, for example, on page 3 he boldly states: "There can be no doubt that in the earliest period of Greek sculpture wood was the dominant material for statues in the round". That there were *xoana* is sufficiently attested by ancient authors, but that wood was the *dominant* material in those parts of Greece where forests were rare is improbable. Take, for example, Paros and Naxos, islands rich in marble. Does it seem probable that the Parians and the Naxians would use from the very beginning any material other than marble? The early island civilization, more accurately called Premycenaean Cycladic, produced idols and vases in marble, and it is evident that these marble idols are not transcriptions into stone of wooden originals. When we come to historic times we again find that the material closest at hand was chosen, and that the technique was usually influenced by the material. At Athens the earliest extant sculpture is of soft limestone from Piræus. This could be modelled much more easily than wood, and on close examination it is evident that the tools used were knife, gouge or curved chisel and saw. Later, when limestone was superseded by marble, there was at first no change in technique; limestone statuary was merely translated into marble. The Moschophorus, arbitrarily called Apollo by Dr. Waldstein, was modelled by an artist who produced with infinite pains all the characteristic peculiarities of limestone statuary. Technical advance due to the introduction of new tools, such as the drill, and the use of emery, was first made when, about 540 B.C., the Chians, who from the very beginning were skilled in marble technique, were invited by Pisistratus to Athens. Dr. Waldstein, however, in discussing the hair of the female figures found on the Acropolis, which belong to this period of Chian influence, explains the zig-zag notching of the long tresses as "corresponding to the rudimentary process of cutting wood with a knife".

To my mind the zig-zag notching is a most natural process in stone technique. How any one can call these statues "later reproductions of the type in stone in which the technique of the earlier wood-carving survived" (5), is inconceivable to me.

Two examples cited by Dr. Waldstein to show the process of change in technique from wood to stone, namely the 'Artemis' from Delos and the 'Hera' from Samos, seem at first glance more to the point.

Indeed, as early as 1884 Professor Brunn advanced the theory that the former reproduced in marble a wooden image carved from a plank, and the latter a *xoanon* carved from a tree-trunk. It is more probable, however, that the shape of the marble block as it was cut in the quarry influenced the artist. The Naxian who made the statue dedicated to Artemis by the Naxian woman Nicandra was a member of a school famous for its workers in marble. He had before him a slab of the shape usually employed for sepulchral stelae, but instead of making a relief he cut away the background, following a process adopted by the coroplasts when they made so-called Melian reliefs. On the other hand the Samian artist who made the statue dedicated to Hera by a certain Cheramyas belonged to a school famous for its workers in bronze. And it seems clear, at least to me, that this statue shows the influence not of wooden, but of bronze technique. The avoidance of undercutting and the cylindrical shape of the body made the casting of such types quite simple. Elsewhere (*American Journal of Archaeology* 11 [1907], 186, fig. 4) I have published a Samian bronze statuette of the same period and style, now in the Archaeological Museum at Madrid; surely no one would claim that there is any trace of wood carving in this figure. Even the Samian terracotta figurines of the archaic period, made from moulds according to a process not dissimilar to that of casting bronze statues, are of the same local style. Further excavations on the island of Samos will undoubtedly bring to light bronze original types of which the so-called Hera is a copy in marble. To use this statue, as Dr. Waldstein does, as illustrative of the process of change in technique from wood to stone, is therefore altogether misleading. For these reasons, as "an introduction into the study of sculpture" the book cannot be recommended.

But Dr. Waldstein distinctly states in his Preface that his own aim "was a more definite one", namely to impress upon students the fact

that the study of physiology must precede the study of pathology, especially in art; that they must learn to draw and model accurately; that they must learn through Nature what she has established in the normal realisation of life and movement; and that in all these respects the spirit of Greek art and the principles which it embodies in its sculpture will be their best guide during a certain phase of their studies.

This part of his presentation is of the utmost value; his ideas are clearly set forth by comparing antique sculpture with the works of Rodin; his advice to students of art is timely and I am sure will correspond with the demands of all instructors in art-schools. Every student of art will benefit by reading these lectures. Dr. Waldstein's warning, "You must not follow a fashion, though you may and ought to follow a tradition while you are learning", ought to be the motto of all young students. By "tradition" he means the tradition established by the ancient Greeks, whose watchword, at least in the fifth and fourth centuries,

was Beauty, or, if you please, Harmony. What our author calls "The Doctrine of Artistic Equivalence in Nature and Life" he ably opposes (36 ff.); these pages form the best part of his book. The upholders of this doctrine preach that you must faithfully reproduce nature, for she is always artistic, always beautiful, and that you must faithfully reproduce life.

Never was better advice given to those who are still learning than the rule laid down on page 46:

You must learn to realise and to reproduce in your art the normal and healthy and typical in nature, before you venture upon the expression and impression of any individual ideas. Do not trouble about your own individuality of expression or your originality. They will look after themselves. If they are there, they cannot be suppressed by any amount of study, of discipline.

At the end of the book there are 78 plates, of which 63 illustrate antique sculpture, and 15 Rodin's work. Some of the plates have been rarely reproduced and are very welcome even to the archaeologist.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

P. V. C. BAUR.

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

- Aberdeen University Review—Nov., *Pro Patria*, by J. R. Wrexford, done into Greek by J. Harrower.
- America—Aug. 8, *Why I am Satisfied with my Education*, F. P. Donnelly.—Dec. 19, *A Greek Schoolmaster Still Teaching* [a discussion of Isocrates], F. P. Donnelly.
- The Antiquary—Dec., *Margidunum* [England]: A Roman Fortified Post on the Fosse Way: Excavations in 1913, F. Oswald and T. D. Pryce; *The Defense of Roman Britain* [Notes on a lecture by W. St. Clair Baddeley]; (Arnold-Bouchier, *Roman System of Provincial Administration* 3); (Gilbert Murray, *On Hamlet and Orestes, A Study in Traditional Types*).
- Athenaeum—Oct. 31, (Sir Robert Allison, *Plautus: Five of his Plays, Translated into English Verse*).—Nov. 28, (Sihler, *Cicero of Arpinum*).—Dec. 19, (Hall, *Aegean Archaeology*).
- Atlantic Monthly—Dec., *Our 'Classical Recollections'*, Annie K. Tuell.
- Church Quarterly Review—Oct., *Magic and Religion, A Study of the Golden Bough*, F. B. Jevons.
- Educational Review—Dec., (A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*); (E. G. Sihler, *Cicero of Arpinum*); (J. M. MacGregor, *Ion of Plato*); (W. S. Davis, *A Day in Old Athens*).—Jan., *The Teaching of English and the Study of the Classics*, Lane Cooper; (Appleton and Jones, *Pons Tironum*).
- Hibbert Journal—July, *The Presence of Savage Elements in the Religion of Cultural Races. An Application of the Methods of Anthropology to Early Mediterranean Civilization*, L. T. Parnell; Warde Fowler, *Roman Ideas of Deity* (L. Solomon).
- Mind—Oct., *Professor Ross on Aristotle's Self-Refutation*, F. C. S. Schiller.
- Modern Language Notes—Jan., E. W. Helmrach, *History of the Chorus in the German Drama* (J. E. Gilbert). [The book is treated largely from the standpoint of Greek and Roman practice].
- Nation (London)—Nov. 14, *The Horatian Temper* [in comments on *Also and Perhaps* by Sir Frank Swettenham]; *Plautus in English* = (Sir Robert Allison, *Plautus: Five of his Plays Translated*).—Dec. 12, (Diana Watts, *The Renaissance of the Greek Ideal*).
- Nation (New York)—Nov. 26, (Haverfield, *Ancient Town-Planning*).—Dec. 3, (Clark, *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism and The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*); *Music, A Lost Art*, E. K. Rand = (Bannister, *Monumenti Vaticani di Paleografia Musicale*).—Dec. 24, *An Historical Parallel* [Diodorus xii, 13: *Treaties and Kultur*], F. H. Fobes.
- Dec. 31, (Burnett, *Greek Philosophy, Part I: The First Christian Emperor* = (Coleman, *Constantine the Great and Christianity*); *Architecture in the Augustan Age* = (Morgan, *Vitruvius: The Ten Books on Architecture*).
- North American Review—Dec., *The Workmanship of Macbeth*, A. Quiller-Couch [the article notices, at one point, the unique resemblance of this work to Greek tragedy].
- Poet Lore—Dec., *The Vengeance of Catullus*, Jaroslav Vrchlicky [a play, translated from the Bohemian, involving Lesbia, Acme, etc.].